



# Thomas Jefferson: Building a Wall of Separation Between Church and State

*Kenton Buck, Justin Davis, Crystal Levenson, Kristina Neighbour,  
Tyler Wake, Amber Wixtrom*

## Abstract

Thomas Jefferson is remembered most often for his roles as founding father, author of the Declaration of Independence, and third president of our nation. However, one of his key achievements is too often forgotten, eclipsed by the drama of our government's creation: the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, which secured the protection of intellectual liberty and individual freedom in the emergent nation of America. It serves in part as the basis for the establishment clause of the Constitution of the United States of America and builds a wall of separation between church and state. In examining Jefferson's role in the creation of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, we focused on the historical, cultural, and political contexts surrounding its passage and the indirect and behind the scenes approach that defined Jefferson's leadership.

Kenton Buck is a Senior at Christopher Newport University and will graduate May 2010 with a B.S. in Biology and a minor in Leadership Studies. He will graduate with honors as a member of Beta Beta Beta and Alpha Chi, and as a member of the President's Leadership Program. Although known for his enthusiasm for science, he enjoys politics, history, and free inquiry which have motivated his interest in Jefferson.

Justin Davis is a Senior at Christopher Newport University and is a member of in the President's Leadership Program. He is majoring in Computer Science with a minor in Leadership Studies. He hopes to be able to get into the Computer Science masters program upon graduation, and wishes to specialize in software design. He also takes an interest in politics, ethics, and other sciences.

Crystal Levenson is Senior at Christopher Newport University, and will graduate in May of 2010. She is a member of the Presidents Leadership program, Alpha Chi Honors Society, and the service fraternity Alpha Phi Omega. She is perusing a Bachelor's of Science in Biology with a minor in Leadership. She devotes her time to many leadership and service activates, such as forming and acting as co-president of the CNU chapter of Jane Goodall Institute's Roots and Shoots club and volunteering for the Virginia Beach SPCA kennel, cattery and wildlife team.

Kristina Neighbour is a Senior at Christopher Newport University and a member of the President's Leadership Program and Honors Program. Kristina is a Political Science major with minors in Leadership Studies and Economics. She will be President of Alpha Phi Omega, the national community service fraternity during the 2009-2010 school year, is a Justice for the Student Government Organization, and is a member of Pi Sigma Alpha, the Political Science Honor Society.

Tyler Wake recently graduated from Christopher Newport University in December 2009 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Philosophy and a minor in Leadership Studies. He graduated with honors, and as a member of the President's Leadership Program, the Honors Program, Phi Sigma Tau, and Alpha Chi. Tyler has served in leadership capacities for the university's Ecology Club and the philosophy honor society, Phi Sigma Tau.

Amber Wixtrom is a senior in the Honors and PLP program, majoring in Literature and Language Arts with a minor in Leadership Studies. After completing her BA, she hopes to go on to earn her Master's in Teaching at CNU. Though her main field of study is English, Amber also enjoys learning about history and the influential leaders like Jefferson who have shaped our country.

## Introduction

While Thomas Jefferson is remembered most often for his roles as founding father, author of the Declaration of Independence, and third president of our nation, one of his key achievements is too often forgotten, eclipsed by the drama of our government's creation. While he labored to bring our nation to independence, Jefferson also strove to protect the people's rights, ensuring their political empowerment and religious freedom. In this vein, he created one of the most profound exemplars of American liberty: the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, a document that represents the essence of Jefferson's lifetime commitment to freedom of thought. In an era where many influential people believed that the establishment of religious conformity was essential to sustaining morality, Jefferson championed the rights of Americans to freely choose and practice their spiritual beliefs without interference from the state, realizing that freedom was worth little unless paired with the liberty of the mind and spirit.

By studying Thomas Jefferson's work with the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, one can gain a deeper understanding of Jefferson's role in promoting and protecting the American liberty we enjoy today. In his historic authorship of the Declaration of Independence, one sees Jefferson establishing our freedom as United States citizens, but it is in the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom that Jefferson's ideas find full expression, extending the inalienable right of liberty not only to Americans' politics, but also to their principles.

## Historical Context

When considering Jefferson's act of writing the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, one must consider the long-term historical forces that may have influenced it. These forces can be grouped into three main categories: economic forces, political forces, and social/intellectual forces. Since the economic and political forces were so related in early America, they will be analyzed together. Although the granting of religious freedom by the First Amendment was influenced by the political/economic context, the Virginia Statute appears to primarily reflect the social/intellectual forces of the time.

The late eighteenth century was the time of the Enlightenment. Enlightenment liberal philosophy, especially that of John Locke, heavily influenced the United States' founding fathers, particularly Jefferson (Sheldon, 2000). A core aspect of Locke's thought is the belief in the natural rights of man, including life, liberty, and property (Locke, 1690). Jefferson's thought as witnessed in the Declaration of Independence and the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom seems distinctly liberal; the concept of the natural rights of man is seen not only in the "certain unalienable Rights" mentioned in the Declaration of Independence (as cited in Koch & Peden, 1944, p. 22), but also in the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom:

[T]he proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which in common with his fellow-citizens he has a natural right. (as cited in Koch & Peden, 1944, p. 312). Enlightenment empiricism, which purports that "[because] no unified truth can emerge from the diversity of perceptions, no one is justified in prescribing moral lessons to others" (Sheldon, 2000, p. 96), gave rise to Lockean social ethics concerned with preventing infringement on the natural rights of others. This prevention of infringement is the very purpose of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom.

At the time of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom's writing and enactment, there were two main political/economic visions. The New England states featured a commercial economy and favored the strong central government advocated by the Federalists, while the southern states featured an agrarian economy and favored the limited central government advocated by the Anti-Federalists. The Constitution, proposed after the Virginia Statute, represented primarily the interests of the Federalists (Beeman, Botein, & Carter, 1987; Sperry, 1946). This did not immediately spell the end of church establishments, because the original First Amendment actually placed no restrictions on the states themselves. In fact, many states maintained their religious establishments throughout the early 1800s (Kramnick, 2005). In addition to the Anti-Federalist goal of limiting the central government's authority, the sheer variety of religious sects among the states made the First Amendment granting freedom of religion a practical necessity (Beeman, Botein, & Carter, 1987;

Sperry, 1946). For example, Massachusetts, the last state to remove its religious establishment, only did so after their Congregationalists “believed Unitarians were getting most of the benefits” (Kramnick, 2005). The Virginia Statute, however, does not appear to be strongly influenced by the political/economic context. Although Jefferson largely agreed with the Anti-Federalist position, the document appears to primarily reflect the intellectual/social context of the Enlightenment and the religious establishments’ abuse of power.

### Contemporary and Cultural Context

Today, the United States is embroiled in a culture war between various political and religious factions. All sides have, at one point or another, tried to claim that their views spring from our country's historical foundation, citing evidence from the founding fathers' writings to support their views. It is important to consider that all sides of the argument, caught up in a modern culture battle, are ignoring a crucial historical detail from the culture war of the past. In understanding Jefferson’s leadership in working to pass the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, it is essential to examine the cultural forces that necessitated its creation as well as Jefferson’s own religious beliefs that contributed to his motivation in writing the Statute.

During his life, Thomas Jefferson was considered a hero to Evangelical Christians, who had been long persecuted under Anglican rule in the South and Puritanical rule in the North. Being a minority, they knew that they could only be free when the majority had no power over them. By keeping church and state separate, they were free to practice religion in their own way. Evangelicals were a driving force that pushed for the ratification of the Bill of Rights by the states (Waldman, 2006).

Although Thomas Jefferson’s words are often cited today to aid any side’s argument, during his lifetime, Jefferson’s religious beliefs caused him an immense deal of trouble. He was subject to some of the worst political smears of his time. With the only basis of these attacks being a few sentences from his *Notes on Virginia*, his name would not be cleared until decades after his death (Gould, 1933).

In his *Notes on Virginia*, he made several comments which contradicted Biblical scripture. For example, he made it clear he did not believe in the famous Biblical flood, on account it would require the creation and disintegration of more water than was actually on the planet. While it is acknowledged by the scholars today that the great flood was in fact a myth, at the time, these words were considered blasphemy. He had also proposed that religious study would be left out of primary school curriculum, claiming children were too young to comprehend religious thought, and thus would be vulnerable to indoctrination. It was this set of beliefs that spurred a distribution of a pamphlet titled “Serious Considerations on the Election of a President,” distributed by William Linn. This pamphlet contained the above ‘indiscretions,’ along with all sorts of rumors, including charges of atheism (Gould, 1933). Pamphlets like that one and many others led people to believe that if Jefferson was elected president, their religion would truly be in danger.

It is ironic, then, that Jefferson did everything he could to keep his religious beliefs hidden from the public eye. In 1824, in a letter to George Thatcher, he commented on how easily a powerful church can defame someone with only a few words (Gould, 1933). He knew that if he published his religious beliefs, he would open up the floodgates to far more slander than he could imagine. Because his beliefs were contrary to the norm, he understood the need for protection of religious ideas. Therefore, the only work in which he made his religious beliefs known was his work *Syllabus*, which he sent to no more than six of his friends. Even members of his own family were kept in the dark about his religious beliefs. Jefferson insisted it was the only way to keep from being seen as directing judgment in that regard. It was not until those pamphlets were being distributed that he gave a copy of *Syllabus* to his daughter. In the final years of his life, when Benjamin Waterhouse asked him for permission to publish *Syllabus*, he flat out refused. His grandchildren would not read it until after his death (Gould, 1933).

In the fall of 1776, Jefferson tried to implement multiple reforms for Virginia. Among these reforms were the disestablishment of the Anglican Church and the separation of church and state. However, the Anglican Church had a strong foothold in Virginia as well as five other states, and had been the established church of Virginia from its inception. The melding of church and state was considered normal for the entire world during this time so separating the two would be considered highly unusual (Peterson, 1994). Largely due to the prompting of James Madison, a compromise between those in favor of the established church and Jefferson

passed in Virginia. This compromise was a mimic of the English Act of Toleration, which allowed other various dissenting non-Anglican factions of Protestant Christianity, such as Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists, to have religious services, provided their place of worship was registered with the government. This still barred differing religions like Roman Catholics and Jews from worshipping freely. People who did not worship, or worshiped with sects not approved by the state, were persecuted and taxed to support the Anglican Church (Peterson, 1994).

By the end of 1776 the worst of religious persecutions, including the taxes supporting the Anglican Church, and prison sentences for religious dissenters, were repealed, but the Anglican Church remained the established church in Virginia. Thomas Jefferson wrote his Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom in 1777, which protected religious minorities from persecution, but progress would be at a stand-still for many years to come (Peterson, 1994). While a series of petitions showed that most people at the time agreed that the Anglican Church should not receive special treatment, the prospect of starting a country without a religious backbone was frightening to many, as a secular attempt at government had not been attempted in the Western World. It was because of this that Jefferson agreed to hold off on a vote on the Statute for Religious Freedom until 1785 (Peterson, 1994). During the fight to pass the bill, the Virginia Tidewater region strongly supported an opposite bill, proposed by Patrick Henry, which would establish Christianity as Virginia's official state religion and allow for tax money to be distributed to churches of all Christian denominations. Although Patrick Henry's bill was expected to pass, James Madison blocked its passage with the heavily signed petition, *Memorial and Remonstrance*, sporting over eleven thousand signatures (Peterson, 1994), and the Statute for Religious Freedom was finally passed by Madison in 1786 (Gaustad, 1998).

### Immediate Context

In passing the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, it was not Jefferson's charisma that swayed opinion, but rather his influence as an intellectual leader. Because he avoided oratory and public speaking, no one would guess that he was a leader. However, physical stature and charisma are not the only traits that make a leader great and differentiate leaders from followers. Jefferson's personality, eloquence, and force of persuasion stem from his writing, which was his primary way of leading.

Leaders are often perceived as individuals inserted in the relational process, exercising face to face exchange with their followers. This style of leadership can be termed "direct leadership", however, according to Gardner (1995), a leader does not need to be the person in the front, giving orders and acting charismatically. Using what he terms "indirect leadership", Gardner asserts that an individual may lead through the ideas they develop and how those ideas influence others (p. 6-7). Because leadership resides in the mind, a leader can influence not only with direct action, but also intellectually with their ideas and the story they embody. Jefferson epitomizes the idea of indirect leadership. While Jefferson preferred puttering around the Monticello gardens, making scientific observations, or reading in his library to delivering a speech or standing before a crowd, he is nevertheless undoubtedly a great leader and father of America. Through the force of his intellect, Jefferson acted behind the scenes to influence other with the power of his ideas.

During raucous congressional debates, Jefferson would usually sit in silence, but this was not problematic because his ideas carried such influence that when he did decide to speak, people listened. It was not his oratory ability that gave him influence over others, but the weight of his ideas. Jefferson indirectly influenced followers who likewise wanted to amend Virginia laws so as to promote the separation of church and state, most notably James Madison. Although Madison was not a follower in the traditional sense, he was instrumental in enacting Jefferson's ideal for religious liberty and securing the passage of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom in 1786. Jefferson's indirect leadership provided the groundwork and motivation with which Madison wrote his own book, *Memorial and Remonstrance against Religious Assessments*, which again used the philosophy of the Enlightenment that Jefferson was so fond of arguing (Cowan, 2001).

Jefferson was a strong leader in every trait except those that had to do with public speaking; Stogdill's 1974 trait theory research fits Jefferson almost exactly. Stogdill found a leader's traits to be achievement, persistence, insight, initiative, self-confidence, responsibility, cooperativeness, tolerance, influence, and sociabil-

ity (Northouse 2007). While Jefferson exemplified all of these throughout his life, Jefferson's strongest trait was his intelligence, cultivated by his exemplary education and scholarly lifestyle.

Jefferson was a leader who acted with conviction and determination, which was especially relevant to the time period of the writing and enacting of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, 1777 – 1786 where religious minorities were discriminated against (Peterson, 1994). Jefferson was persistent in his desire and work for religious freedom, although Jefferson considered the struggle to enact the Virginia Statute the "severest" struggle in which he had ever engaged (Peterson, 1994, p. 114). Jefferson began his battle for religious freedom and the separation of church and state with a speech to the House of Delegates in November 1776 (Peterson, 1994). He outlined the history of religious establishments, and condemned it both in terms of political realism, or what would best lead to the security of the state, and human rights, noting the fact that religious dissenters in Virginia were being taxed by the Anglican Church. While the House was debating the issue of whether to have a single state church or become a pluralist state, Jefferson asked the key question of whether the state has "a right to adopt an opinion in matters of religion" (Peterson, 1994, p. 116); to Jefferson, using Locke's reasoning, as stated in his *Two Treatises of Government*, it did not.

Jefferson was motivated to lobby the Virginia government to ensure religious freedom for all people because he believed that it was a natural right. According to theories of civil government, men enter into government to secure those rights they cannot secure themselves (Locke, 1690). But religious conscience does not depend upon civil authority and "cannot abide coercion, for religion in its nature depends upon the inward persuasions of the mind" (Peterson, 1994). As Jefferson wrote in the draft for the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, "The legitimate powers of government extend to such acts only as are injurious to others. But it does me no injury for my neighbor to say there are twenty gods or no god. It neither picks my pocket, nor breaks my leg" (Peterson, 1994, p. 119). Not only did Jefferson believe that intervention in religion was harmful to the people and to states by eliminating the freedom of inquiry, he also thought that intervention was harmful to religion itself, stating "Millions of innocent men, women, and children since the introduction of Christianity, have been burnt, tortured, fined, imprisoned, yet we have not advanced one inch towards uniformity. What has been the effect of coercion? To make one half the world fools, and the other half hypocrites" (Peterson, 1994, p. 119).

Jefferson's leadership empowered not only his immediate followers, but also the American people, his followers in a broader sense, who would benefit from religious liberty. Unlike many of his contemporaries, who doubted Americans' ability to govern themselves, Jefferson believed in the feasibility of self-government, promoting the participation of the people in the public sphere. In a letter to Edward Carrington, he wrote, "I am persuaded myself that the good sense of the people will always be found to be the best army. They may be led astray for a moment, but will soon correct themselves" (Duncan, 1995, p. 49). Jefferson's belief in the people's competence served to empower them to achieve the phenomenal advances of independent governance that would characterize America through Jefferson's time and beyond.

Because of this belief in the capability of the people to self-govern, Jefferson rejected the use of coercion to influence followers. Though he sought to influence others to see the reason of his ideas, Jefferson did not want to force them to conform to his modes of thinking, instead preferring the use of rational persuasion to influence his followers. One of the engravings on the Jefferson memorial in Washington, D. C. says, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." Jefferson's followers, likewise, resisted coercion from other forces. Noticing his followers' proficiency as highly independent thinkers, Jefferson called them "our rope of sand," and therefore "opted to lead without appearing to lead; to instruct while appearing only to suggest; to guide while seeming to defer" (Ellis & Wildavsky, 1989, p. 68). Jefferson was always a great supporter of intellectual debate, and therefore believed that policymaking should be filtered through an indirectly elected upper house so that decisions would be reflective and rational, which might not be the case if majority rule were the sole determiner in decisions (Saunders, 2002, p. 14). Much of the time, he corresponded with his followers through mail

It took Jefferson nearly a decade of work to have his goal of implementing into law the Statute that would ensure that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument

to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in nowise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities. (“Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom” as cited in Koch & Peden, 1944, p. 313).

In more ways than one, the stronghold of the society dominated by the Anglican Church in Virginia was the largest roadblock to the Statute for Religious Freedom. Jefferson's progressive views clashed with the religious establishment, and ultimately stalled the debate on the Statute (Peterson, 1994). Fear of running a state without institutionalized religion combined with a lack of support from Virginia's Tidewater region caused the bill to be shelved for nearly ten years (Gaustad, 1998).

While Thomas Jefferson may not have seemed a great leader to a person meeting him for the first time, he was an incredibly influential man, who drew from several sources of power on the French and Raven Power Taxonomy, which includes referent power, expert power, legitimate power, reward power, and coercive power (Northouse, 2007). In his leadership, Jefferson primarily used legitimate, expert, and referent power, while avoiding coercive power and never seriously displaying reward power.

In 1776, Jefferson was elected to the Virginia House of Delegates and between 1779 and 1781 he served as Governor of Virginia. During these times, he used his power of position to try to pass the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, while using both legitimate, expert, and referent powers. Legitimate power means that the target person complies because he believes the agent has the right to make the request, and the target person has the obligation to at least listen to, if not comply with the request (French and Raven as cited in Northouse, 2007). Through his legislative role and political position, Jefferson exercised this power.

Expert power is effected when the target person believes that the leader has special knowledge about the best way to do something (French and Raven as cited in Northouse, 2007). Jefferson used his expert power frequently since it fit well with his intellectual personality. He used expert power naturally, drawing from his wealth of experience in regards to foreign diplomacy, legislative work, and Enlightenment philosophy, while listening seriously to other people's concerns and suggestions. According to Gardner (1995), expertise is essential to the inspiration of the mind that indirect leaders use to influence followers. Jefferson used his expert power not only in relations with his followers such as James Madison in passing the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, but also in his writing, where he his belief for freedom of religion took shape to influence more people indirectly.

Referent power is derived from the desire of others to please an agent toward whom they have strong feelings of affection, admiration, and loyalty; it is fundamentally related to respect (French and Raven as cited in Northouse, 2007). Jefferson built this respect through his personal writing and publications. He established an indirect relationship with many influential minds of his day, and because of the respect and admiration he earned over his lifetime, he was able to influence others with his persuasive ideas. Jefferson possessed this power when he came out of Philadelphia as the father of America's greatest document and when he was working to pass the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom. Like with his expert power, his referent power in the form of deep respect was a strong element to his indirect leadership.

Jefferson's use of power was paradoxical because he “was a tireless opponent of the abuse of power in government, but he had a fascination with power that he used to promote his own privileged position in society” (Saunders, 2002, p. 28). While he may have wanted to advance his privileged position as a gentleman planter leading the comfortable life in Monticello, dominance over other men was never an ambition of his. Indeed, describing Jefferson's use of power is difficult as he was strongly against using coercive power as a leader. Jefferson once wrote that he could not, “conceive how any rational being could propose happiness to himself from the exercise of powers over others” (cited in Ellis & Wildavsky, 1989, p. 69). To Jefferson, leadership was only legitimate if based off of conciliation and persuasion (Williams, 1913). As a member of the Virginia House committee on religion, Jefferson used his legitimate power and his remarkable abilities of persuasion to influence its formerly church-dominated policies toward a more secular-based approach, setting in motion a series of “slow and gradual steps by which ecclesiastical influence in state affairs... were destroyed in Virginia” (Williams, 1913, p. 247).

The historical, cultural, and immediate context surrounding Jefferson not only clashed with his ideas, but also greatly shaped his views. The era of Enlightenment influenced both the formation his progressive views and his call for religious freedom, but the stronghold of certain religious beliefs attempted to block him at every turn. Embodying many of Stogdill's traits of successful leaders and utilizing legitimate, expert,

and referent power, Jefferson labored to enact change and protect religious liberty. He acted as an indirect leader, influencing others with the power of his thoughts and ideas. It was through his brilliant eloquence as a writer and his resolve that he managed to persevere and ultimately help form the essential political principles of Jefferson's time.

### Conclusion

Leadership involves acting to bring intended change within a given set of circumstances. While this definition describes a process strongly affected by contextual influence, leadership is still contingent upon the action of the leader. Acting within his time, to improve his era, the leader in history both confronts and collaborates with a vast variety of cultural and historical forces to achieve a world better than the one in which he lives. As a leader, Jefferson was successful in navigating the cultural, political, and religious currents of his time, while re-directing specific streams towards a more tolerant, free, and independent flow of national thought. Through his work with the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, as well as his other accomplishments, Thomas Jefferson promoted and set the precedent for a national narrative of individual freedom, securing the establishment of intellectual liberty in the emergent nation of America. Of his life accomplishments, it was the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, along with the Declaration of Independence and the founding of the University of Virginia, which Jefferson wanted listed on his epitaph when he died in 1826.

Through Jefferson's commitment to intellectual freedom, coupled with his formidable writing skills, he achieved great victories for the liberty of human thought in America. Utilizing legitimate, expert, and referent power, he and his followers achieved the formation of a new nation, succeeding in leading the new country towards cementing its ideals of liberty of thought, equality of opportunity, and the public good. From Jefferson, today's leaders can learn the key role of indirect leadership, viewing the dual roles of influence through expert and referent power and action through legitimate power, realizing that change can be effected and achieved through methods other than commanding from the front or the top. Through studying Jefferson's life, modern students of leadership can learn the positive power of ambition channeled into socialized power and a commitment to public values, qualities which Jefferson manifested in every step of his leadership.

Though many aspects of Jefferson's leadership were timeless, such as his passion for religious tolerance and intellectual liberty, his leadership was aided significantly by his context, as we have shown. Acting in the freedom-charged atmosphere of the years just after the American Revolution, a time infused with the potential of a new nation's creation, Jefferson was able to implement his ideas behind the scenes, within a more receptive and flexible atmosphere than either his forefathers or descendants experienced. Though in today's political and national contexts, within our long-embedded bureaucracy, achieving change on such a fundamental level as Jefferson achieved is more difficult, today's leaders can still draw from Jefferson's universal dedication to liberty and his context-specific application of freedom-based principles to work for change in their own environments. By recognizing the contexts within which Jefferson acted, and how these shaped the timing and cultivation of his leadership, leaders from any time can become more aware of their own contexts, adapting their tactics to achieve their leadership goals and values. Developing one's own deeply-held values, respecting those of others and protecting the ability of all groups in society to exercise their rights and intellectual freedoms – these are aspects of leadership that can be incorporated in all contexts, aspects which Jefferson himself held as the epicenter of his life, which directed all his action. If through using these principles, uniting knowledge of one's context with a constant concern for the people one serves, a leader of today can achieve positive change, that leader will surely achieve the essence of leadership, whatever their context and cause. Jefferson would be proud.

## References

- Beeman, R., Botein, S., & Carter, E. C. (1987). *Beyond confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American national identity*. Chapel Hill: University of NC Press.
- Cowan, D. E. (2001). *Sacred Texts*. Retrieved November 15, 2008, from Religious Movements Homepage Project Web site: <http://religiousfreedom.lib.virginia.edu/sacred/>
- Duncan, C. M. (1995). *The anti-federalists and early American political thought*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Ellis, R. & Wildavsky, A. (1989). *Dilemmas of presidential leadership: from Washington through Lincoln*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gaustad, E. S. (1998). Thomas Jefferson, religious freedom, and the Supreme Court. *Church History*, 67(4). Retrieved September 16, 2008, from ProQuest Religion database.
- Gould, W. (1933). The religious opinions of Thomas Jefferson, *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 20 (2). Retrieved September 16, 2008, from JSTOR database.
- Koch, A. & Peden, W. (Eds.). (1944). *The life and selected writings of Jefferson*. New York: Random House.
- Kramnick, I. (2005). *The Godless Constitution*. New York: Norton.
- Locke, J. (1690). Book Two, Section 87 of Chapter VII: Of Political or Civil Society. *Two Treatises On Government*. Retrieved November 18, 2009 from The Online Library of Liberty.
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Peterson, M. (1994). Jefferson and religious freedom. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 274(6). Retrieved September 16, 2008, from EBSCOhost database.
- Saunders, R. M. (2002). *Power, the presidency, and the preamble: interpretive essays on selected presidents of the United States*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Sheldon, G. W. (2000). Liberalism, classicism, and Christianity in Jefferson's political thought. In G. Sheldon & D. Dreisbach (Eds.), *Religion and political culture in Jefferson's Virginia* (pp. 93-106). New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Sperry, W. L. (1946). *Religion in America*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Waldman, S. (2006). The framers and the faithful. *The Washington Monthly*, 38(4). Retrieved September 16, 2008, from Research Library database.
- Williams, J. S. (1913). *Thomas Jefferson: His permanent influence on American institutions*. New York: Columbia University Press.